

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
1st December, 2009

Attendance (X indicates present, exc indicates excused, pre-arranged absence)

Adjunct Faculty

Mangan, Michael(Hum) X

Behavioral & Social Sciences

Firestone, Randy X

Gold, Christina X

Widman, Lance X

Wynne, Michael X

Mannen, Angela

Business

Siddiqui, Junaid X

Lau, Philip S X

Counseling

Jackson, Brenda EXC

Jeffries, Chris X

Key, Ken

Pajo, Christina X

Fine Arts

Ahmadpour, Ali X

Bloomberg, Randall X

Crossman, Mark

Schultz, Patrick X

Wells, Chris X

Health Sciences & Athletics

Hazell, Tom

McGinley, Pat X

Rosales, Kathleen EXC

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent X

Marcoux, Pete X

McLaughlin, Kate X

Peppard, Bruce X

Simon, Jenny

Industry & Technology

Gebert, Pat X

Hofmann, Ed X

MacPherson, Lee

Marston, Doug

Learning Resources Unit

Striepe, Claudia X

Ichinaga, Moon X

Mathematical Sciences

Boerger, John

Fry, Greg

Glucksman, Marc X

Taylor, Susan X

Yun, Paul X

Natural Sciences

Cowell, Chas

Herzig, Chuck EXC

Jimenez, Miguel X

Palos Teresa X

Vakil, David X

Academic Affairs

Chapman, Quajuana

ECC CEC Members

Evans, Jerome

Norton, Tom

Panski, Saul

Pratt, Estina

Smith, Darwin

Assoc. Students Org.

Casper, Joshua

Safazada, Ana X

Stokes, Philip X

Ex- Officio Positions

Arce, Francisco X

Nishime, Jeanie

Shadish, Elizabeth

Kjeseth, Lars X

Guests and/Other Officers: Connie Fitzsimons (Dean's Rep), Barbara Jaffe, Lars Kjeseth, Barbara Perez

Unless noted otherwise, all page numbers refer to the packet used during the meeting, not the current packet you are reading now.

The sixth Academic Senate meeting of the Fall 2009 semester was called to order at 12:34pm

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes [pp. 5 -11 of packet] from the 3rd November Academic Senate meeting were approved after the suggested revisions had been reviewed.

The minutes [pp. 12- 17 of packet] of the 17th November meeting were approved. Chris Gold noted a spelling error on pg. 15 that will be corrected.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

President's report – Dave Vakil (henceforth DV)

DV reported **no progress** or update on the idea of **creating a campus-wide wiki** to discuss the potential impact of faculty adding extra students above cap, but gave thanks to Senator Peppard for his useful comments on the issue. Similarly, there has been no progress on the **ratification of 2 constitutional amendments**. [see pp 23-24 of packet] for review.

DV noted that a **Full-time Faculty hiring prioritized list** was available [see p. 41 of packet] DV added that the list was not “solid” yet, but thought that the campus might approve up to 7 new hires. Dr. Arce said that a finalized list would be sent out to faculty later today. DV reported that Linda Galluchi would be retiring this year.

Regarding **Faculty laptops**, DV said that his announcement at last senate meeting had been premature. Laptops may not be coming in immediate future. Susan Taylor asked about the plan. DV said that Dr. Fallo and Mr. Wagstaff were working on a plan. Susan Taylor noted that if they were working on a plan did that mean there was no plan as had been previously implied? DV said that there are several plans involving computers and technology, but he was not sure what they were or how detailed they were. Dr. Arce said that Mr. Wagstaff is currently busy verifying the computer situation and determining who has what. He said that there are also several series – 500, 600, 800 – that are being verified as well. There exists some confusion over who has what. Once the verification process is complete, we will be able to assess what is needed. Also, it has not been decided who will pay for what.

On the **construction** front, DV reported that the Business building demolition has begun, and a new Business building will rise in its place. All trees inside fences are to be cut down, to be replaced later. 3 trees near Art & BSS will also cut & will be replaced elsewhere. The plan is to have more trees than previously.

Dr. Fallo expects a **draft of the ACCJC report** re: Accreditation, this week, and the **FCMAT report for Compton** is due in January.

DV reported that **fee increases** up to \$50/unit are being discussed at state level, and that **graduation rates** are becoming an important metric.

State and Federal discussions are underway on the topic of **Basic Skills students** getting AA/AS and Bachelor's degree. The discussions seem to be aimed at looking for evidence to justify funding.

Dr. Fallo reportedly announced **no mid- year cuts to the ECC budget**, but said that **budget cuts for next year look severe**.

DV expressed a wish that the **ECC Academic Senate meet at least once at the Compton** campus during the Spring semester. DV asked for input on which date would be most suitable, and asked that the LAST Spring meeting NOT be used. DV noted that the partnership is 3 years old, and we have never had a meeting at the CEC, while the Compton senators have

always had to come to ECC. Many agreed with DV. Mr. Widman asked about the possibility of video conferencing. It was noted that the video conferencing room is not big enough to hold all of the senators. Ms. Perez said that Library Room 102 had video conferencing capabilities and was large. Mr. Kjeseth suggested the new Distance Education Classroom. Mr. Siddiqui suggested DV provide lunch as an incentive. Mr. Bloomberg suggested some ECC senators go to CEC and others who could not make it participate via teleconference, that way a smaller room could be used. DV will look into the possibility of using a bus to transport the Senators, following a comment from Ms. Jeffries that Compton has huge busses.

DV noted that **Katie Gleason had been invited to give a presentation** about the ECC Foundation at 1:40pm

VP – Compton Center - Saul Panski (SP)

No report. DV reported that Mr. Panski had had his car stolen from his driveway and was dealing with that issue.

Curriculum Committee – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

LK reported that 22 Out-of-Compliance Courses remain. These have been attended to but will not reach the Committee until Spring, and 78 Course Reviews are scheduled for Spring 2010 for ECC to remain in compliance.

LK mentioned the Six-Year Cycle Planning Documents, noting that faculty will have to participate in creating the cycle.

CurricUNET training is set for March 8 – 11, 2010 on- site at ECC. Key people will be trained, and they will in turn train others.

VP - Educational Policies – Chris Jeffries (CJ)

No report.

[See pages 42-43 of packet] for BP & AP 4050: Articulation - to have its second reading later this meeting.

.

VP - Faculty Development – Chris Gold (CG)

No report.

VP - Finance & Special Projects/Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC)– Lance Widman (LW)

No report

Council of Dean's Meeting Report –Moon Ichinaga (MI)

[See pp 21-22 of packet].

DV thanked MI for her detailed, accurate, and complete reports.

On the issue of “no show” reports and accurate rosters; Deans have been asked to “write faculty up” if they do not process no show reports and maintain accurate rosters. Mr. Wells asked what that meant. Ms. Perez said that reports were a job responsibility and non- compliance could lead to disciplinary action. Ms. Ichinaga noted that the responsibility fell under “keeping accurate records”. Ms. Perez added that we get paid by the State for the students and the college could owe the State money if we were audited. So the no- show and first census reports are important.

DV wanted to remark on an item from the minutes of Nov 19, where it was reported that “It was recommended to redirect students to adult schools for basic skills training. When resources are reduced, we cannot serve all students. We will need to prioritize what services to offer students.” DV said he was doing his utmost to keep the Academic Senate involved in Basic Skills issues. Dr. Arce noted that the quote must be taken in context. The College must look at all places to make cuts, the question is where/how to prioritize the cuts, and this option was part of

the discussion. A recommendation was made to look at Adult Schools. Dr. Arce noted that he had investigated Adult Schools in the area, but they, too, have been drastically cut- back. Dr. Arce agreed it is an important issue to keep discussing. Mr. Ahmadpour emphasized that he wanted to conduct a teach- in as he felt the Basic Skills cuts were an attempt at re-segregation. Mr. Ahmadpour offered to bring in experts from UCLA for a discussion of the topic.

MI noted a correction from “girls soccer team” to ‘women’s soccer team” on pg.22

VP – Legislative Action – Chris Wells (CW)

CW noted a new legal opinion on the issue of catalog rights that he will include in the next packet.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Department Chairs – Faculty opinion.

[See pp. 25- 40 of packet]

DV noted the requested list of Program Reviews requesting Department Chairs on p.28 of packet.

DV has summarized the potential duties of Chairs on pp. 26-27 of packet. These have been grouped into 7 major categories: Student- centered, Curriculum, Communication and Liaison, Department coordination, Planning Facilities and Budgeting, Personnel and Professional Development, and Scheduling classes.

DV invited comment. Ms. Gebert noted that most other Community Colleges have Dept. Chairs, while our faculty do these duties and teach. Ms. Gebert did not see how departments could run efficiently without Dept. Chairs. DV noted that a few departments DO have Chairs/Coordinators. Mr. Siddiqui agreed, and said it was the Business Division’s view that they MUST have a Dept. Chair.

Mr. Ahmadpour noted that the consensus of the Fine Arts Dept, was against having Dept. Chairs, Mr. Bloomberg said he felt the Fine Arts Dept. were rather on the fence about the matter, and had wanted more clarification on the duties before finally deciding. Mr. Ahmadpour agreed that there were many ambiguities to clear up, for instance, would there be financial compensation for the post? Mr. Ahmadpour recommended crafting a proposal , then opening the issue to faculty vote.

Mr. Marcoux said that DV had done a great job putting all this paperwork together. He felt that each Dept. would have its own needs and the paperwork would provide a list/framework of what is possible. He noted too, that each campus is unique in its structure.

DV said that this was a brainstorming session. Academic Senate would not be able to speak to matters like compensation.

Dr. Gold asked how the few, current Chairs/Coordinators came to be created. Ms. Perez said that Nursing and Respiratory care had one faculty member responsible for liaising with hospitals re: embedding students. These positions did receive compensation for the Spring Fall semesters for this and other duties undertaken over and above teaching. As for the so-called Lead Counselor position, no such position was possible per the current contract. This had been created within the Counselling Dept. itself as an internal matter, and approved by Cabinet. There were a [very] few Program Directors and Faculty Coordinators, and their responsibilities were to help the relevant Dean. This has gone in cycles over the years.

Dr. Gold noted that then there was no Dept. Chair model at ECC.

Ms. Safazada asked Mr. Ahmadpour why he was against the concept of Dept. Chairs? Mr. Ahmadpour noted that there was not the time for a full discussion, but speaking from personal experience he had many bad concrete examples from other campuses. He repeated that

there were many ambiguities. Mr. Bloomberg noted that while he had no final opinion, he understood that this could be a position of power, and he thought the Chair might have a hand in choosing part-time faculty.

DV reminded the Senators that the responsibilities could still be discussed.

Mr. Wells said that he had the opposite reaction, noting that part-timers are currently not appointed by people in the Dept. and therefore some part-timers end up teaching classes they are not qualified for. Ms. Perez said that that should not happen as there is a documented process for the hiring of part-timers and that concerns should be routed to her. Mr. Ahmadpour noted that on other campuses, the Dept. Chair WAS the main person in hiring part-time faculty. Mr. Firestone said that the Philosophy Dept was so small, with only 3 faculty, that they did not need a Chair, but Divisions should be flexible on whether or not they need or wanted a Dept. Chair. Mr. Firestone said he was concerned about potential costs and he felt the College should not do anything that would create costs. He also felt that faculty chairs should come from within the same Dept. and not be from another Dept. or Division.

DV was asked to provide, at some stage, definitions of Dept. Chairs and Faculty Coordinators for comparison.

Mr. Marcoux said that we should approach the issue from the perspective of asking “What problems exist in _____ Dept, and will having a Dept. Chair solve them?”

Mr. Kjeseth suggested backing off of the label “department Chair” and calling it something else, to avoid the confusions and stigmas. He also suggested looking at the list of duties and refining it. Mr. Kjeseth noted that ECC has an unfunded mandate to be practitioners of SLO’s on an ongoing basis. He could see the Dept. Chairs coordinating these efforts. He felt that current faculty have more duties than past faculty, and we could ask whether we could do it all with the current situation in place, or did we need a Dept. Chair to help get things done? If we cannot cope we should do something. Mr. Kjeseth opined that we do NOT have the faculty, the tools, or the time to achieve desired levels of sustainability in many areas.

Mr. Siddiqui agreed, noting that in the Business Division, the second largest Division on campus, the issue was that of sheer size. Ms. Gebert noted that it was not a matter of extra salary, but a matter of having someone take charge of certain matters. She noted that the job could be rotated amongst faculty of any Dept.

DV agreed it might be a good idea to rename the position. Mr. Ahmadpour said the duties should be refined, but warned that Dept. Chairs, once invested with authority, had the potential to become dictatorial. Mr. Wells spoke of the need to distinguish between leadership and leaders, noting that some faculty want to avoid leadership so there is a need for Chairs willing to take on the leader role.

Ms. Ichinaga posed a question to Ms. Gebert asking whether the Chair position she spoke of in the Cosmetology Dept. was one Ms. Gebert had volunteered for or had been asked to assume. Ms. Gebert replied that the position had been a rotating position amongst the Cosmetology faculty, but as the positions dwindled with the downsizing of the Dept., she had been stuck with the duties. Some holders of the position in the past had been paid, but not currently.

Ms. Safazada asked whether all Depts. would have Chairs, or only those who requested it? DV noted that no decisions had been made as things were still in the discussion stage.

Ms. Perez said it would not do to have a Chair take on the SLO duties, just to take the duties off the backs of other faculty. Job change with the times, and SLO’s are now part of everybody’s jobs.

Dr. Gold said that it had not been suggested that the Dept. Chair take over the SLO duties, but the SLO coordinators have a lot of work to do managing SLO efforts of the faculty in their areas, and Chairs could help.

Mr. Kjeseth said he had noted that a lot of the work on the campus was done by “the usual suspects” and we should move away from that. SLO are really getting to be a major part of

what we do and needs coordination. Deans currently have too much to do, and needed the help a Dept. Chair/Coordinator could provide. It was his opinion that ECC could be facing a troubling situation.

Mr. Marcoux agreed, noting that as a faculty member he administers and assesses SLO's but saw the need for someone to coordinate the efforts and write the reports.

Mr. Mangan agreed citing the situation at Orange Coast College where he also teaches. The English Dept there has 2 chairs who deal with scheduling and SLO's, and it is their job to coordinate efforts and keep things running smoothly. At Cypress College, the Chair position is rotated, and this helped keep the impulse to be authoritarian to a minimum. Mr. Mangan was not certain, but thought it possible that they get overload pay.

Ms. Jeffries asked what the ECC Deans thought of the idea of Dept. Chairs. DV said that he had not wanted to speak to the Deans until he had heard from the faculty. Ms. Jeffries noted that she saw no agreement amongst the faculty. Mr. Glucksman suggested making a similar prioritization list for Dept. Chairs as the Faculty Hiring Prioritization form on pg. 41 of packet, and let the Dean's decide which positions to implement. DV thought that an interesting idea.

DV thought that the next step would be to examine and refine the list of essential Dept. Chair duties. PM suggested the Senators talk more on the issue to their Depts. and spoke of a possible need to survey the Depts. Mr. Wells noted that some programs have only one person, and that these folk were de facto Dept. Chairs.

PM suggested forming a subcommittee to come up with some definitions and a survey. Ms. McGinley seconded that proposal. Everyone agreed that the subcommittee was a good idea. DV asked for volunteers for the Committee and Ms. Gebert, Mr. Ahmadpour, and Dr. Shadish agreed.

Mr. Kjeseth suggested that Mr. Vakil begin a conversation with the deans, and DV agreed that he would do so on a one-on-one basis. It was agreed that the subcommittee would convene in the Spring.

NEW BUSINESS

Presentation from Katie Gleason – ECC Foundation Director.

After some discussion on whether to postpone Ms. Gleason's presentation until the next meeting as many Senators had left; it was decided to go ahead with the presentation. Ms. Gleason distributed a packet of handouts.

Ms. Gleason reported that in May 2008, Bernard Osher left \$25 million to Community Colleges statewide to establish a permanent scholarship program. He challenged the colleges to raise an extra \$50 million by June 2011, and if this was successful, an extra \$25 million would be added to the fund. So there is a potential \$100 million to draw from for scholarships. The 2007/08 FTES numbers were examined and each Community College was given a target goal amount to reach. ECC need to raise \$1million, and has already raised \$600,000. Some companies, like Edison, have also stepped forward to give money, as well as other philanthropists like the Lindquists. Ms. Gleason noted this as an historic opportunity to step up and help, noting that on-campus the Board of Trustees have made a commitment to pledge \$25 thousand, and the ECC and CEC managers have pledged an amount as well. People are giving because they know how important education is, said Ms. Gleason.

Ms. Gleason spoke of the materials in the packet that would enable us to contribute, and noted that by working collectively we could make a difference in people's lives. We have until June to reach our goal. It is also important not to succeed as a State and as a Community College system with this challenge as other states are watching to see if we can do it. We can make contributions via payroll or as single gifts. A question was asked about how to contribute if one was already paying in to the Foundation? Ms. Gleason said that one could get a slip to designate the amount specifically for the Osher campaign until June.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Program Review highlight: Journalism - to be presented by Kate McLaughlin.

PUBLIC COMMENT.

None

The Academic Senate meeting was adjourned at 2:00pm

Cs/ecc2009